

### Remarks

In the Office Action, Claims 34-41 and claims 46-53 were rejected under 35 U. S. C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Horn (US Publication 2002/0198962) in view of Bailey (US Patent 6,785,671). Further, claims 36-41 and 46-53 were rejected under 35 U. S. C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Horn (US Publication 2002/0198962) in view of Bailey (US Patent 6,785,671) as applied to claims 34-35 above and further in view of Sommerer (US Publication 2004/0003351). Furthermore, Claims 46-49 and claims 50-53 were also rejected under 35 U. S. C. §101 as being directed to non-patentable subject matter. Accordingly, Applicants have amended claims 34-41 and claims 46-53 so as to distinctly and particularly point out the attributes of the present invention and to overcome both the 35 U. S. C. §103(a) rejection of claims 34-41 and claims 46-53 and the 35 U. S. C. §101 non-statutory subject matter rejection with respect to claims 46-53 in order to place the application in condition for allowance.

Applicants have amended their claims to distinctly point out that the list of web sites names visited by a user are displayed in an order where each of the web site names is displayed with a respective graphic having an intensity that corresponds to a respective time since last visit to the respective web site or frequency of visits and where the list of web site names does not display either a time or a date next to each of the web site names. Accordingly, Applicant contends that neither Horn (US Publication 2002/0198962) nor Bailey (US Patent 6,785,671) nor Sommerer (US Publication 2004/0003351) separately or combined teach the present claims, as amended. Horn

teaches, as shown in FIG. 11, displaying dates and times with the listing of web pages in a search history. In that the proposed combination of Horn in view of Bailey and Horn in view of Bailey in view of Sommerer, all teach Horn's displaying of date and time with the listing of web pages in a search history. Given that the current claims specifically claim displaying the list without either the time or date with the web sites, and given that the references actually teach away from the claimed invention, the rejection should be withdrawn. The combinations of Horn (US Publication 2002/0198962) in view of Bailey (US Patent 6,785,671) and Horn (US Publication 2002/0198962) in view of Bailey (US Patent 6,785,671) in view of Sommerer (US Publication 2004/0003351) teach the opposite of the present claims.

Applicants are not conceding in this application that the previously presented claims are not patentable over the art cited by the Examiner, as the present claim amendments are only for facilitating expeditious prosecution of the application. Applicants respectfully reserve the right to pursue these and other claims in one or more continuation applications. Thus, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the presently amended Claims 34-41 and 46-53 and request that the 35 U. S. C. §103(a) rejection of Claims 34-41 and 46-53 and the 35 U. S. C. §101 rejection of claims 46-53 be withdrawn and Applicants respectfully request allowance of the present amended claims. Accordingly, Applicants believe that the present Claims 34-41 and 46-53 are in condition for allowance.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the claim rejections and objections and allowance of the present Claims 34-41 and 46-53 in this case are respectfully requested.

If these amendments do not result in a Notice of Allowance, Applicants respectfully request a telephone interview to accelerate prosecution of the application.

Respectfully submitted,

/Silvy Anna Murphy/

Silvy Anna Murphy  
Attorney for Applicants  
Reg. No. 44,959  
P. O. Box 1254  
Cary, North Carolina 27512  
Phone: 919-859-2360  
Fax: 919-233-9242